

REMARKS

The Specification has been amended to reference copending US patent application No. 09/880341 entitled "Weighted Decay System And Method" of inventor Allen Yu filed June 13, 2001.

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-21, and 23-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 16, 20 and 23 have been amended. Claim 22 has been cancelled. Please consider the following remarks for allowance of the pending claims.

Rejection of 1, 3-11 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The office action of November 29, 2005 rejected claims 1, 3-11 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight (US 6,493,703) in view of Tso (US 6,742,047) and further in view of Williams (US Pub. Patent Application Number 2001/0054029). For a 35 USC103(a) rejection, each element of the claim must be taught in the references and one of ordinary skill in the art must be motivated to combine the references to make the claimed invention.

This combination of references fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least one element of claim 1 and fails to provide motivation to make the invention as claimed in claim 1. As noted in the action, Knight does not disclose "accessing topical categories that include a plurality of keywords associated with the categories." Similarly, Tso fails to disclose this element as well. Column 2, lines 6-64 of Tso describes that a user or administrator can provide keywords or groups of keywords for filters that will block content containing those keywords. There is no disclosure of "topical categories" having keywords associated with them. A human provides keywords upon which Tso content filtering system processes on a keyword basis.

Knight fails to teach “associating a plurality of resources with the keywords, wherein the resources refer to digital objects” as the keywords are those associated with the “topical categories.”

Additionally, as noted the combination of Knight and Tso fails to disclose, suggest or motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to perform “weighing user activities associated with keywords, based on a time period that has passed since user activity occurred for users belonging to the aggregate community.” Williams is entitled a System and Method of Background Advertising in Web Pages and does mention criteria for alternating the background advertising on a web page in paragraph [0005]. However, as described in paragraph [0024], Williams is not “weighing user activities associated with keywords based on a time period that has passed since user activity occurred for users belonging to the aggregate community.” Instead, Williams describes rotating the background based on the time of day or rotating the web page each time the user returns to the web page. For each of these approaches the time basis is not related to “a time period that has passed since user activity” and “weighing user activities associated with keywords” is irrelevant. Thus this element of claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Knight in view of Tso in view of Williams.

Claims 3-10 depend from claim 1, so the arguments for claim 1 are applicable to them as well. Furthermore, the combination of Knight in view of Tso in view of Williams fails to teach, disclose, suggest or motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to make the additional features of claims 3-10.

As discussed for claim 1 above, the combination of Knight in view of Tso in view of Williams fails to disclose, suggest or motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to make the

invention as claimed in amended claim 11. For example, as similarly discussed for claim 1, the combination of Knight in view of Tso fails to disclose or suggest “accessing topical categories that include a plurality of keywords connected to categories.” Additionally, the combination of Knight in view of Tso in view of Williams fails to disclose or suggest “weighing activity associated with keywords based on a time period that has passed since user activity occurred for each user belonging to the aggregate community.”

Claims 13-15 depend from claim 11, so the arguments for claim 11 are applicable to them as well. Furthermore, the combination of Knight in view of Tso in view of Williams fails to teach, disclose, suggest or motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to make the additional features of claims 13-15.

Rejection of claims 16-18, 20-21 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The office action of November 29, 2005 rejected claims 16-18 and 20-21, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight (US 6,493,703) in view of Tso (US 6,742,047).

This combination of references fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least one element of independent claim 16 and fails to provide motivation to make the invention as claimed in claim 16. As noted in the action, Knight does not disclose “organizing a plurality of topical search contexts that maps at least one keyword to each topical search context.” Similarly, Tso fails to disclose this element as well. Column 2, lines 6-64 of Tso describes that a user or administrator can provide keywords or groups of keywords for filters that will block content containing those keywords. There is no disclosure of “map[ping] at least one keyword to each topical search context.” Knight fails to teach “associating a plurality of resources with the at least one

keyword” as Knight fails to disclose that the “at least one keyword” is mapped to a “topical search context.”

Claims 17-18 depend from claim 16, so the arguments for claim 16 are applicable to them as well. Furthermore, the combination of Knight in view of Tso fails to teach, disclose, suggest or motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to make the additional features of claims 17-18.

The arguments with respect to claims 1 and 16 above are also applicable in explaining why the combination of Knight in view of Tso fails to teach, disclose, suggest or motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to make the invention as claimed in claim 20. As discussed above, this combination fails to disclose or suggest at least “accessing topical categories that include a plurality of keywords associated with the categories” or “associating a plurality of resources with the keywords, wherein the resources refer to digital objects.”

Claim 21 depends from claim 20, so the arguments for claim 21 are applicable to it as well. Furthermore, the combination of Knight in view of Tso fails to teach, disclose, suggest or motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to make the additional features of claim 21.

The arguments with respect to claims 1 and 16 above are also applicable in explaining why the combination of Knight in view of Tso fails to teach, disclose, suggest or motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to make the invention as claimed in claim 23. As discussed above, this combination fails to disclose or suggest at least “computer readable program code means for accessing topical categories that include a plurality of keywords associated with the categories” or “computer readable program code means associating a plurality of resources with the keywords, wherein the resources refer to digital objects.”

Claim 24 depends from claim 1, so the arguments for claim 1 are applicable to it as well.

Furthermore, either of the combination of Knight in view of Tso or the combination of Knight in view of Tso in view of Williams fails to teach, disclose, suggest or motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to make the additional features of claim 24.

Conclusion

In light of the arguments presented above, pending claims 1, 3-11, 13-21, and 23-24 as amended are in condition for allowance, and applicants respectfully request a notice of allowance.

DATED this 29th day of March 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



Eileen Lehmann

Registration No. 39, 272

Hewlett-Packard Company

Mail Stop: 1197

1501 Page Mill Road

Palo Alto, CA 94304

Telephone: (650) 857-7940

Fax: (650) 852-8063